



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Part of King Henry VI, in which Jack Cade takes refuge in Iden's garden. He is exhausted by rapid flight and by hunger and is looking for herbs with which to appease his appetite. Iden, the owner of the garden, discovers him, and after a fight which is provoked by Cade, kills him. Furthermore in this scene Lady Oldcastle says to her husband :

"Lay then your head upon my lap."

Mortimer (Act III, Sc. 1, *First Part of King Henry IV*) is thus addressed by his wife—Glen-dower interpreting—

"On the wanton rushes lay you down
And rest your gentle head upon her lap."

The points of resemblance cited above are sufficient, I think, to prove that what may reasonably be considered among the most effective passages and characters in the six plays of Shakespeare and his possible collaborators which deal with the York-Lancaster dissensions—embryo and otherwise—were closely imitated and drawn upon by the authors⁵ of *Sir John Oldcastle*.

R. S. FORSYTHE.

University of Kansas.

A GERMAN TRANSLATION OF PAS-SAGES IN THOMSON'S SEASONS

In 1745 Bodmer brought out an edition of Pyra and Lange's poems under the title : *Thirsis und Damons Freundschaftliche Lieder*. In the volume, as will be recalled, was included an anonymous German translation of three episodes from Thomson's *Seasons* bearing the respective titles : *Lavinia*, *Damon*, and *Celadon und Amalia*. The only German text accessible to me is that of the second edition, which was prepared by Lange in 1749.¹ Referring to the translation in question, Lange says in his preface : "[ich] habe die, der ersten Ausgabe angehängten Erzählungen auch bei die-

ser Auflage gelassen," from which I infer that he retained them in their original form.

On the German version of these three passages Theodor Vetter in the *Bodmer Denkschrift*,² comments as follows :

- "1. Lavinia=Thomson's *Autumn*, 177-310.
Nur wenig weggelassen ; im Ganzen genau und gut übersetzt.
2. Damon=Thomson's *Summer*, 1268 bis ca. 1330. Sehr frei, mit Weglassungen und Abänderungen.
3. Celadon und Amalia=Thomson's *Summer*, 1171-1222. Genau übersetzt."

It was probably an oversight on the part of Vetter when he attempted to compare the German translation with the wrong English version, as he seems to have done. Thomson, as is well known, made several revisions of the *Seasons*, and as a consequence it is a somewhat puzzling matter to follow the changing text of the various earlier editions of the poem.

A word about those editions of the *Seasons* which primarily concern us here will perhaps not be amiss. According to Zippel³ the quarto edition, which appeared in 1730, was the first collected edition of the *Seasons*. In the same year another edition, in octavo, appeared ; the text, save for six additional lines in *Winter*, being identical with that of the quarto. 1738 saw another edition, the text of which is practically the same as that of the octavo, but the new text of the two editions of 1744 contains "additions of above one thousand new lines." For the reading of *Summer* as contained in this expanded version I depend upon Zippel's critical edition of the *Seasons* in which the text of *Summer* of 1744 is reproduced in full (cf. Zippel, p. 61 ff.) ; the variants of *Autumn* (1744) are given by Zippel in footnotes. For the purpose of comparison I consult the first edition of the collected *Seasons*, i. e., the text of 1730 which, as already noted, is virtually identical with that of 1738.

¹Joh. Jak. Bodmer. Denkschrift zum C. C. Geburtstag. Zürich, 1900, p. 377.

²Otto Zippel : *Thomson's Seasons*. Critical edition. "Being a reproduction of the original texts, with all the various readings of the later editions, historically arranged." Berlin, 1908. Cf. p. x.

⁵I have followed Henslowe in assigning *Oldcastle* to several authors. He gives as collaborators, Munday, Drayton, Wilson, and Hathway.

¹Cf. *Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*, No. 22 (1885), p. 153 ff.

Vetter does not indicate which edition of the *Seasons* he had before him. At first sight it seemed natural to suppose, however, that it was one or the other of the two parallel editions of 1744. That—chronologically at any rate—might well have been the case; but, strange to say, I discovered upon examination that Vetter's numbering of the verses agrees with the edition of 1746. This would, of course, confront us with a situation at once quite impossible, chronologically, inasmuch as the first edition of the German translation came out in the year previous, viz., 1745. The question of the 1746 edition—whether this particular edition was used by Vetter or not—may therefore be dismissed forthwith; this text, however, compared with that of 1744, contains all told but eleven additional lines,⁴ so that a confusion of these two editions would, in the question before us, be of no great consequence. Whether either of the editions of 1744, however, is to be regarded as the basis of the translator's version, is the important question. This now remains to be examined.

Comparing the German version of the *Lavinia* passage with the first (1730) edition of the collected *Seasons*, I find that there are no omissions whatever, and this, oddly enough, contrary to the commentator's statement: "Nur wenig weggelassen." How shall we explain the discrepancy? In the edition of 1744 we read, *e. g.* (*Autumn*, ll. 185-9):

"By solitude and deep surrounding shades,
But more by bashful modesty, concealed.
Together thus they shunn'd the cruel scorn
Which virtue, sunk to poverty, would meet
From giddy fashion and low-minded pride."

Except for a variant of the third line above, this entire passage is one of the poet's many later expansions, and as such is, of course, lacking in the 1730 edition; but it is important to note that it is also wanting in the German version before us.

Again, in *Autumn*, ll. 206-7 (ed. 1744), the passage

"their best attire,
Beyond the pomp of dress"

is lacking in the first edition, and this, too, we do not find in the German translation. Compared

⁴*Ibid.*, p. xi.

with the edition of 1730 the following passages in *Autumn* (1744) show later variations or expansions: ll. 210-17, 239-40, 248, 288, 291-4, and in each case the German version agrees in every detail with the text of 1730 and not with that of 1744. This partial list of examples adduced from the *Lavinia* passage will suffice to show why the comment "Nur wenig weggelassen" needs revision. To go at once to the root of the matter, the situation seems to be this: it was not the translator who omitted anything, but Thomson who made additions in a later version; and these later additions are lacking in the German translation simply because they are lacking in the English text of 1730.

But it is in connection with the *Damon* episode that the Swiss scholar permitted himself—from the very nature of the case—to be betrayed into a more egregious error. "Sehr frei, mit Weglassungen und Abänderungen," in his judgment here. But it is simply the poet's own radical alterations and extensive additions in the later text which seem to have misled him to hold the anonymous but none the less able and conscientious translator accountable for the apparent discrepancy. As a matter of fact the translation of this particular episode, instead of being "very free, with omissions and alterations," seems quite as close as a metrical translation can well be and is, moreover, without any omissions whatsoever. If it were my purpose, at this time, to present a detailed study instead of a mere brief note, I should deem it necessary to quote the two variant *Damon* passages, of 1730 and 1744, in full,—so widely does Thomson's own later, revised form of the episode differ from his earlier version. Indeed, it is not too much to say that by reducing the number of characters in the *Damon* episode and by otherwise changing the situation, Thomson, in the later version, gives us an altogether new story. Nevertheless—to repeat for the sake of emphasis—the German version clearly and closely follows the earlier form of the episode as found in the virtually identical editions of 1730 and 1738.

Of the German version of the *Celadon and Amelia* episode the commentator says: "Genau übersetzt." With respect to the text of 1730 this would be quite true; hardly, however, with reference to the later expanded version, for, aside

from a number of minor verbal differences, there is at least one passage in the later (1744) English edition [also in the ed. of 1746] which is wanting both in the earlier version and in the German translation. The passage includes ll. 1184-6 (ed. 1744):

"and where its mazes stray'd,
While with each other blest, creative love
Still bade eternal Eden smile around."

Perhaps it will be helpful to compare at least one passage from the *Celadon and Amelia* episode of 1744 with the corresponding passage as found in the text of 1730.

Summer, ll. 1206-8, ed. 1744 :

"From his void embrace,
Mysterious heaven ! that moment, *to the ground*
A blacken'd corse, was struck the beauteous maid."

Summer, ll. 937-9, ed. 1730 :

"From his void embrace,
Mysterious heaven ! that moment, *in a heap*
Of pallid ashes fell the beauteous maid."

The translator's version here, as indeed throughout the three episodes, faithfully follows the *text*, though not necessarily the *edition*, of 1730 for, as I have already pointed out, the edition of 1738 is virtually parallel with it. The German version of the passage just quoted reads as follows :

"Aus seinen Armen *fiel*, o des geheimen Schicksals !
Das schöne Kind denselben Augenblick
In einen Aschehaufen."

Proceeding on the assumption that for the purpose in hand the text, but to repeat, not necessarily the edition, of 1730 is to be regarded as authoritative, I renumber the three passages as follows :

1. The *Lavinia* passage = *Autumn*, ll. 184-307.
2. The *Damon* passage = *Summer*, ll. 980-1037.
3. The *Celadon und Amalia* passage = *Summer*, ll. 897-944.

A glance will show that this numbering differs in each case from that of Vetter.

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

Harvard University.

THE SUITORS IN THE *PARLEMENT* OF *FOULES* AGAIN

It is a pleasure to express my appreciation of the article by Mr. Samuel Moore of Harvard in the January number of the *Notes*, because his facts do, in some sense, reenforce the case I presented in the July number of *Modern Philology*. I am pleased also, that he so fully accepts the conclusions of that paper. Yet I should like to correct one point in which Mr. Moore seems to do my paper something of injustice. It occurs in the following passage :

"Professor Emerson decides without hesitation that the second eagle represents Friedrich of Meissen. His chief reason for the decision is that it would be 'a strange procedure on Chaucer's part to introduce, as a rival suitor of Richard, one whose betrothal had been broken off as early as 1373, at least seven, perhaps nine years before the time of the poem.' He offers no evidence of the breaking off of the earlier match."

A reading of the original article¹ will show that in these sentences I am calling attention to Professor Koch's reference to "the strange procedure on Chaucer's part," and his emphasis upon the possible lack of knowledge regarding affairs in Germany.² My real argument begins with the next sentence, which Mr. Moore does not quote : "At any rate Chaucer would scarcely have been likely to use this long-past betrothal, if there had been a more active suitor in the field." I then present at length the extremely active three, Friedrich of Meissen, Charles of France, and Richard II. My argument, then, is in the activity of these three, and their closer relation in time than any other suitor who has yet been named. If accepted at all, the reasoning carries with it the exclusion of any fourth suitor, especially one in whose case no activity has yet been proved for almost ten years before Anne's marriage.

To put the matter in another way, in his poem Chaucer had limited the suitors of Anne to three. The three chronologically nearest her marriage were those I have just named. They, also, are logically the only ones to be considered, because of

¹ *Modern Philology*, VIII, 47.

² *Essays on Chaucer*, 407-8.